

Culture and Cultural Politics Under Reza Shah

The Pahlavi State, New Bourgeoisie and
the Creation of a Modern Society in Iran

Edited by
Bianca Devos and Christoph Werner



First published 2014
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business
© 2014 Bianca Devos and Christoph Werner

The right of the editors to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Culture and cultural politics under Reza Shah : the Pahlavi state, new bourgeoisie and the creation of a modern society in Iran / edited by Bianca Devos and Christoph Werner.

pages cm. – (Iranian studies)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Politics and culture – Iran – History – 20th century. 2. Iran – Cultural policy – History – 20th century. 3. Iran – Politics and government–1925–1979. 4. Iran – Intellectual life – 20th century. 5. Iran – Social conditions – 20th century. 6. Social change – Iran – History – 20th century. I. Devos, Bianca, author, editor of compilation. II. Werner, Christoph, 1967-author, editor of compilation.

DS317.C85 2013

955.05'2 – dc23

2013005107

ISBN: 978-0-415-82419-4 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-203-79842-3 (ebk)

Typeset in Times New Roman
by Taylor & Francis Books

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	vii
<i>Notes on contributors</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiii
Introduction	1
BIANCA DEVOS AND CHRISTOPH WERNER	
PART I	
Intellectuals and technocrats: Key figures in Iran's cultural modernization	17
1 Modernization in literary history: Malek al-Sho'ara Bahar's <i>Stylistics</i>	19
ROXANE HAAG-HIGUCHI	
2 Policy or puzzle? The foundation of the University of Tehran between ideal conception and pragmatic realization	37
CHRISTL CATANZARO	
3 Mir Mehdi Varzandeh and the introduction of modern physical education in Iran	55
H. E. CHEHABI	
4 Modernization of Iranian music during the reign of Reza Shah	73
KEIVAN AGHAMOHSENI	
5 The king's white walls: Modernism and bourgeois architecture	95
TALINN GRIGOR	

vi *Contents*

PART II

The Shah: State politics and authoritarian modernization **119**

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 6 Archaeology and the Iranian National Museum: Qajar and early Pahlavi cultural policies
NADER NASIRI-MOGHADDAM | 121 |
| 7 Depicting power: Reza Shah's rule, cabinet politics and the commemorative stamp set of 1935
ROMAN SIEBERTZ | 149 |
| 8 Press censorship in the Reza Shah era, 1925–41
KARIM SOLEIMANI | 181 |

PART III

Life under Reza Shah: new bourgeois culture and other forms of practiced modernity **199**

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 9 Drama and operetta at the Red Lion and Sun:
Theatre in Tabriz 1927–41
CHRISTOPH WERNER | 201 |
| 10 "Newly Hatched Chickens": Bozorg 'Alavi on the young literary scene of the 1930s
ROJA DEHDARIAN | 233 |
| 11 Giving birth to a new generation: Midwifery in the public health system of the Reza Shah era
ELHAM MALEKZADEH | 249 |
| 12 Engineering a modern society? Adoptions of new technologies in early Pahlavi Iran
BIANCA DEVOS | 266 |
| 13 Religious aspects in communication processes in early Pahlavi Iran
KATJA FÖLLMER | 288 |
| <i>Index</i> | 319 |

6 Archaeology and the Iranian National Museum

Qajar and early Pahlavi cultural policies*

Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam

On 18 October 1927, just two years after the accession of Reza Shah Pahlavi, the French archaeological monopoly in Iran that had been granted 42 years earlier by Naser al-Din Shah Qajar, was abolished by a bilateral agreement. This exclusive privilege, which had become “perpetual” in 1900 with a renewed agreement signed by his successor Mozaffar al-Din Shah, had allowed France to establish a beautiful collection of antiquities, exhibited in the Louvre Museum. Nowadays, when we visit these antiquities, we wonder in which context such an archaeological monopoly had been granted and whether the Qajar monarchs, who signed it, had truly ignored the importance of Iran’s heritage? Or whether by granting such a monopoly to carry out excavations, maybe they also wanted their kingdom to benefit from its cultural treasures by exhibiting a part of the discoveries belonging to Iran in a National Museum of their own? In this regard, we wonder whether an archaeological museum did exist at all in Iran during the Qajar period or whether this institution had been created for the first time under Reza Shah Pahlavi.

The abolition of the French archaeological monopoly is generally considered as a hallmark of the cultural nationalism of the Iranian government during the reign of Reza Shah. However, if the purpose of this decision was to end the grip of France on Iranian heritage, how can we explain the appointment of a French archaeologist, André Godard (1881–1965), as the head of the General Antiquities Service of Iran (*Edareh-ye Koll-e ‘Atiqat*) and other Iranian archaeological institutions for more than twenty years?

On the other hand, we know that Iran’s international policy under Reza Shah was to look for a “third power” that could act as a counterweight to British and Soviet pressure. To this end, Iran developed closer relations with Germany. So, how did German archaeologists react to Godard’s nomination? What did this French archaeologist accomplish for Persian heritage in accordance with Reza Shah’s cultural policy?

These are the guiding questions to which this chapter tries to provide answers in the binary context of cultural and foreign policy. For this, we will first present briefly the history of French archaeology in Iran. Then, we will examine the Iranian archaeological institutions before the rise of Reza Shah.

Finally, we will discuss the abolition of the French monopoly and its impact on archaeology and archaeological institutions in Iran under the reign of Reza Shah, with a particular focus on the cultural policies of the Iranian government at that time.

A quick glance at the history of archaeology and the archaeological institutions in Iran before the rise of Reza Shah

Archaeology and the French monopoly

Since the Renaissance, Western artists have been captivated by the mystery of the great Oriental civilizations, and some ancient Persian sites mentioned in Greek, Roman, and Biblical texts have attracted their attention. This fascination was increasingly reinforced by European travellers who, for different reasons, visited Iran between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries and described the ancient sites in their travel accounts using illustrations and engravings. Among these travellers, several of them brought ancient Persian objects – results of commercial excavations carried out by the Iranians – to the West in order to enrich their “cabinets of curiosities” or to sell them to collectors who wanted to invest in Oriental art and archaeology.

This passion for the Orient in general and for Persia in particular is also due to European romanticism, which in the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries led several Western writers, artists, and scientists to visit Persia. French Orientalists, painters, archaeologists, and politicians such as Pascal-Xavier Coste (1787–1879) and Eugène Flandin (1809–89) created and published beautiful drawings of monuments and ancient Persian ruins in the first half of the nineteenth century.¹

Although these French explorers studied the western, northern, and central parts of Persia thoroughly, the south-western areas of the country, with the archaeological site of Susa and its 6000 years of history, escaped their attention. It was explored for the first time in 1850 by the British geologist William Kennett Loftus (1821–58).² But the British scientific world, much more fascinated by the archaeological discoveries in Mesopotamia, did not pay enough attention to Loftus’ explorations. Thus, after a few years, he abandoned Susa and handed it over to French archaeologists who, led by Marcel Dieulafoy (1844–1920), carried out excavations there from 1884.³ These excavations were undertaken in accordance with the first Franco-Persian archaeological convention, based on the equitable sharing of discoveries, ratified in November 1884 by Naser al-Din Shah Qajar, who had a passionate interest in art and archaeology. Dieulafoy’s mission was brought to an end after only two years in 1886 because he had violated the convention and had taken all of his discoveries to Paris.⁴ This violation interrupted the French archaeological activities at Susa for almost ten years. Finally, on 12 May 1895, Naser al-Din Shah pardoned Dieulafoy’s actions and signed a second archaeological convention with the French government. This new document, still based on the equitable sharing

of discoveries, permitted France to carry out excavations and initiate digs all over Iran. One year after signing this monopoly, on 1 May 1896, Naser al-Din Shah was assassinated. This assassination again delayed the return of French archaeologists to Iran. Finally, in 1897, instead of Dieulafoy's mission, an archaeological delegation under Jacques de Morgan (1857–1924) was sent to Iran. Received in audience on 19 October 1897 by the new monarch Mozaffar al-Din Shah, Jacques de Morgan obtained a royal decree (*farman*) endorsing the second Franco-Persian archaeological convention of 1895. But Jacques de Morgan falsified the translation of this *farman* and violated the archaeological convention as well by sending some of his discoveries secretly to Paris in diplomatic bags or via the French consulate in Baghdad. Despite his agreement with the Persian authorities to share excavated objects at the end of each season, he stored the discoveries of his three excavation seasons in Susa (1897–1900) in the castle built for this purpose and waited for a good moment to transfer all of them to Paris.⁵ This chance arose earlier than expected, when on 11 August 1900, Mozaffar al-Din Shah, travelling in France at that time during his first tour to Europe, signed the third Franco-Persian archaeological convention. This document made the French monopoly perpetual and guaranteed France all of the discoveries from Susa, including gold or silver artefacts for which the French delegation only had to pay the equivalent of the respective metal weight to the Persian government. In the rest of Iran, France could carry out excavations based on the principle of equitable sharing of the discoveries. In 1901, counting on this third convention – which was however not retroactive – Jacques de Morgan sent all the archaeological discoveries excavated in Susa since 1897 to the Louvre.⁶

After the Constitutional Revolution in 1906, the French archaeological privilege was threatened by a surge of national pride in Persia questioning the exclusive role of foreigners, sentiments which were partly fanned by German intrigues. The constitutionalists accused the French delegation of limiting their excavations to Susa, where they were able to exercise exclusive control and all discoveries belonged to the French government, instead of organizing excavations also in other places. There of course, the French would have had to share objects and discoveries equally. These criticisms had an indirect impact on French archaeological activities in Persia. On the other hand, between 1906 and 1908, Jacques de Morgan was involved in a financial scandal in Paris. Although he was finally acquitted, he resigned in October 1912 and the delegation was abolished.⁷ Shortly thereafter, the French Organization for Public Enlightenment sent several missions to Persia in order to explore various archaeological sites in the four corners of the country and thus to maintain the French monopoly. The outbreak of the First World War in 1914 prevented these missions from succeeding in their task. The War interrupted all the French archaeological activities in Persia, and it was only after 1920 that Roland de Mecquenem, who succeeded Jacques de Morgan as head of the archaeological mission at Susa, restarted the French excavations in this region with reduced funding.

After the coup d'état by Reza Khan on 21 February 1921, the French archaeological monopoly was increasingly threatened. In 1924, when Reza Khan, then prime minister and commander-in-chief of the army, personally led a military campaign into Khuzestan against Sheykh Khaz'al, he also visited Susa, and to his great dismay learned about the French archaeological monopoly. Only three years after this visit, on 18 October 1927, the French monopoly was abolished. But before approaching this issue, let us re-examine the history of two institutions in Iran dealing with excavations, archaeology, and artefacts under Qajar rule, especially at the time of the French archaeological monopoly: the Antiquities Service and the Archaeological Museum. Crucial for an understanding of Pahlavi politics in the field of antiquities and archaeology, however, are other institutions that were already established, albeit in a different form, under Qajar rule. Amongst these are the Antiquities Service, the forerunner of the present-day *Sazman-e Miras-e Farhangi*, and the precursors to the National Archaeological Museum of Iran, usually considered to have been an original invention of Reza Shah.

The Antiquities Service (Edareh-ye 'Atiqat)

The Ministry of Sciences (*Vezarat-e 'Olum*) was created in Iran as far back as the summer of 1866, during the reign of Naser al-Din Shah. However, only after the Constitutional Revolution this ministry was reshaped and now also included the management of national antiquities amongst its responsibilities. In March 1907, when the Council of Ministers was presented for the first time to the National Consultative Assembly (*Majles-e Shura-ye Melli*), the Ministry of Education (*Vezarat-e Ma'aref va Owqaf va Sanaye'-e Mostazrafeh*) consisted of six administrative sections, including one responsible for archaeological excavations and another for ancient monuments.⁸ The exact functions and activities of these two sections are not entirely clear due to a lack of detailed sources, but we can imagine that during the period of "minor despotism" under Mohammad 'Ali Shah (1907–9), when the country was experiencing major disorder, not only was the question of antiquities not on the agenda, but these two sections, like many others, were closed by the Shah. It was therefore only after the second victory of the constitutionalists, in July 1909, that the nationalist revolutionaries turned their attention towards Iran's heritage. With this in mind, in 1910, the Antiquities Service (*Edareh-ye 'Atiqat*) was created for the first time in Iran.⁹ Most studies concerned with the history of Persian archaeological institutions report incorrectly that this service was founded in 1918.¹⁰ However, a ministerial order from 11 May 1910, preserved in the archives of the Cultural Heritage Organization in Tehran, reveals that exactly at that time, Sani‘ al-Dowleh,¹¹ the minister of education, established the Antiquities Service under the direction of the Persian poet Iraj Mirza Jalal al-Mamalek with the task of managing everything concerning antiquities and excavations as well as the art market.¹² Iraj Mirza placed both sections, archaeological excavations and ancient monuments, under his authority and

already in July 1910 had expanded his scope of action by setting up branches of the Antiquities Service in the provinces. Consequently, the Antiquities Service, located in the building of Dar al-Fonun in Tehran, formally took the title of Central Antiquities Service (*Edareh-ye Markazi-e 'Atiqat*) with the following functions and goals:

- taxation of antiquities excavated on private lands
- prohibition of illegal excavations
- formalization and permanent control of commercial excavations
- regularization of all cases of excavated objects by adopting the antiquity law of the National Consultative Assembly.¹³

In June 1910, the Central Antiquities Service wrote a draft law of six articles and sent it to the National Consultative Assembly to be adopted as the Antiquities Law. The Assembly transferred the text to the commission of public instruction, which after writing several amendments, presented it again to the Assembly on 5 January 1911, now comprising eleven articles under the title “bill on antiquities” (*qanun-e 'atiqat*). Although this text did not run counter to the French archaeological monopoly, it was removed by the Council of Ministers on 13 April 1911 after the Legation of France intervened and asked for the Franco–Persian archaeological convention of 1900 to be taken into account.¹⁴

After two months, while the convention and the proposed bill on antiquities were reviewed in the Council of Ministers, the National Consultative Assembly again discussed this project, from 15 June 1911 onwards. The protocols of this reading, which took place in five sessions, inform us about the views of the deputies at that time with regard to objects found during excavations in Iran. We can distinguish three different groups:

- The ‘*olama*’ considered all archaeological discoveries found on private land as treasure (*kanz*) that belonged to the owner and upon which the state had no rights. Thus, according to the ‘*olama*’, it was not necessary to establish the Antiquities Law in order to control excavations on private property or to tax discoveries found on private land.
- The merchants opted for the adaptation of the Antiquities Law, but were hostile to a huge tax on antiquities so that excavators could continue their work.
- For intellectuals and scholars the ratification of the Antiquities Law was of primordial importance. They were also the proponents of a tax on excavations as well as on the purchase and sale of antiques. Moreover, they envisioned the creation of a National Museum in order to preserve Persian antiquities.¹⁵

On 17 June 1911, after the first reading of the bill on antiquities, the majority of the deputies voted for this project. However, it was never applied, and was

126 Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam

de facto forgotten. With no law on excavated objects and with only one non-ratified law, the administration headed by Iraj Mirza, which since September 1910 was named the General Antiquities Service (*Edareh-ye Kolle-e 'Atiqat*), could neither forbid clandestine excavations nor tax antiquities in the art market. All this led to the dissolution of the General Antiquities Service on 8 October 1911, only eighteen months after its establishment.¹⁶

As a consequence, taxation of the antiquities market and the process of formalizing Iranian commercial excavations were suspended. According to the administrative law of the Ministry of Education, the Sciences Service (*Edareh-ye Ma'aref*) henceforth looked after the affairs of antiquities in the country for a period of approximately one year. During that time, the most important event was the attempt of the Ministry of Education to try to modify the French Archaeological monopoly.¹⁷

This attempt, although it did not succeed, further threatened the French archaeological interests in Iran and lead Jacques de Morgan in October 1911 to prepare a text in which he proposed the modifications relative to the Convention of 1900. He wrote this text entitled “*Projet de Convention et Observation*” for possible negotiations with the Iranian government. In this draft, which was never implemented, he both stated and limited in geographical terms the excavations of the French delegation, while protecting the absolute archaeological interests of France for a period of 99 years. However, given the circumstances of that time, it became clear that the Persian authorities would not be satisfied with small changes. This is clear from the fact that in October 1912 the Iranian Ministry of Education set up a “Commission of Excavations” in order to reconsider the French archaeological monopoly and present modifications on the Franco-Persian convention of 1900.¹⁸ Thus, after long negotiations, on 7 December 1912, the Commission drew up an amended text consisting of a preamble and twelve articles. According to this draft, the original of which is kept in the Iranian National Archives, the right to conduct archaeological excavations throughout Iran was granted to France for a period of fifty years, subject to the sharing of discoveries including those of Susa. In return for this privilege, the French government would undertake to help Iran in the construction of an archaeological museum in Tehran.¹⁹

In December 1912, the Iranian Ministry of Education sent a copy of this modified project to the Iranian Ministry of Foreign Affairs in order to share it with the French authorities, through the mediation of Samad Khan Momtaz al-Saltaneh, then Persian plenipotentiary minister in Paris.²⁰ However, no trace of this document can be found in the French archives. We are therefore unaware of the ultimate outcome of these efforts from both sides before the First World War to reconsider and possibly modify the French archaeological privilege. We only know that in May 1913, the Persian government took up the idea to modify the French monopoly and hired a Belgian architect to prepare a proposal for the reorganization of archaeological excavations in Iran. However, following protests from the French Legation in Tehran, this

decision was cancelled and the idea of modifications of the archaeological monopoly again came to naught.²¹

On 23 April 1914, Hakim al-Molk,²² then minister of education, sent a request to the Council of Ministers asking to re-establish the Antiquities Service. He briefly mentioned the history of the creation of the Antiquities Service four years earlier, the success of this organization during its 18 months in operation, and finally its discontinuation because of a lack of an antiquities law. Hakim al-Molk concluded his letter by wishing that this Service would be restored and that the draft Antiquities Law, suspended for several years in the National Consultative Assembly, would be adopted.²³

Hakim al-Molk's request was welcomed by the Council of Ministers and the Antiquities Service was re-established during the summer of 1914 under the direction of Hoseyn Khan Amini, who replaced Iraj Mirza.²⁴ Despite the re-establishment of the Antiquities Service, the bill remained un-ratified and the Service was forced to make do with its internal regulation to manage the affairs of the country's antiquities.

The Archaeological Museum

In France, on 27 July 1793, four years after the French Revolution, the Louvre under the name "Museum of Arts" became the first European National Museum.²⁵ In Persia, about a century later, in 1876, the first Royal Museum was created by order of Naser al-Din Shah in his Golestan Palace in Tehran.²⁶ This creation, in the second half of the nineteenth century, shows the interest of this sovereign in the Iranian heritage. After his second trip to Europe (May–July 1878), Naser al-Din Shah, who was fascinated by the grandeur of European museums, charged his brother-in-law Mirza Yahya Khan Mo'tamed al-Molk, then minister of construction (*vazir-e bana'i*), to renovate the Royal Museum.²⁷ So, after about three years of work, the new building was opened in 1881, still in the Golestan Palace, but in a space much larger than the former one.²⁸

The new premises of the Museum were so lavish and sumptuous that it was often used for formal audiences. This is the reason why it was also called *talar-e salam* ("hall of audiences").²⁹ Thus, the representatives of foreign countries in Tehran, when they were received in audience by Naser al-Din Shah, had the chance to visit the Royal Museum, of which the king was very proud. We may mention Samuel Green Wheeler Benjamin, the envoy of the United States in Tehran during the years 1883–85, who described the Museum as follows:

The most imposing portion of the palace of Nasr-ed-Deen Shah is the grand audience-chamber, which in dimensions and splendour of effect is one of the most imposing halls in the world. The ceiling and mural decorations are of stucco, but so were those in the Alhambra. The floor is paved with beautiful glazed tiles, arranged in the most exquisite mosaic. In the centre

of the hall is a large table overlaid with beaten gold, and a long row of arm-chairs are massively splendid with the same costly material covering every inch of space.³⁰

The following passage from Briton George Nathaniel Curzon's famous work on Persia shows that various items were displayed in this Royal Museum:

[The] new Museum, a great hall or gallery, ... to contain not only the Royal Regalia, but also the vast collection of "objets d'art" and curiosities, which the generosity of foreign crowned heads, or his own whims, have enabled him to amass during a reign of over forty years. This extraordinary chamber, which with its contents alternately resembles an Aladdin's palace, an old curiosity shop, a prince's wardrobe, and a municipal museum ... in which are displayed, side by side, treasures of priceless value and the most unutterable rubbish.³¹

Under Mozaffar al-Din Shah's reign the Royal Museum also contained objects, often of poor quality, bought by the Shah during his travels in Europe. In other words, the Royal Museum played the role of an exhibition gallery of Western objects, as Claude Anet wrote in 1905 in his travel account.³² Although Mozaffar al-Din Shah was less interested in archaeology than his father, the first talks concerning the creation of a national archaeological museum in Tehran date back to the beginning of his reign. In October 1897, when Jacques de Morgan was received in audience, he proposed to the Shah the creation of a National Archaeological Museum in Tehran. In fact, he very much feared "to see the Persians sell their share of the antiquities" and wanted to preserve these objects and prevent them from being removed; especially, because he considered the idea that France could easily preserve its archaeological interests in Persia in the future by nominating a Frenchman as a director of such a new museum.³³ However, after a short period, when the first three excavation seasons had led to remarkable results, he no longer supported the creation of an archaeological museum in Tehran and instead sought to safeguard all his discoveries for France. Therefore, despite the Shah's persistence in building this museum, French diplomacy took advantage of the pro-French disposition of the Persian prime minister Amin al-Soltan, who succeeded in making the Shah abandon his project.³⁴

As the diplomatic archives of the Quai d'Orsay reveal, the minister of France in Tehran, disturbed by the surge of national pride in Iran in the wake of the Constitutional Revolution of 1906, believed that the creation of a small museum in Tehran that might keep and display those parts of the excavations that could not be stored in the Louvre would be an excellent way to ensure the French archaeological privilege.³⁵ But Jacques de Morgan, who

considered this revolution “on the whole, only a farce,”³⁶ was not at all favourable to this idea:

... créer un musée à Téhéran et y mettre une partie de nos découvertes, serait de faire renoncer à notre monopole exclusif. Ce serait ouvrir la porte aux demandes du Chah et des Persans et faire naître de ce fait des difficultés qui forcément tôt ou tard amoindrirraient nos droits.³⁷

The idea to create a National Archaeological Museum in Tehran, delayed because of French interests, was taken up again in 1910 with the establishment of the Antiquities Service. This service confiscated objects from illegal excavations and sent them to the Department of Education in order to be preserved in the museum that this service intended to build in the near future. The discontinuation of the Antiquities Service postponed this project once again for several years. But in March 1917, thanks to the efforts of the minister of education, Momtaz al-Molk,³⁸ the first National Museum (*Muzeh-ye melli-ye Iran*) was finally inaugurated in the building of this ministry situated to the north of the Dar al-Fonun.³⁹

Three hundred antique objects were preserved and exhibited in this museum, which according to its statutes was open three days per week: Sunday, Wednesday, and Friday.⁴⁰ The catalogue of the museum, probably written by Momtaz al-Molk, reveals the level of knowledge the curators had about the antiquities in their possession: except for the weight of objects and their source, no further information was given. In this catalogue, which was only an inventory of the objects, neither dimensions nor ornaments were mentioned. Moreover, the fact that inscriptions were left without being deciphered shows the ignorance or rather the incompetence of the curators. Nevertheless, we must not forget that the National Museum was the first of its kind and its beautiful collection later on became the basic foundation to the Iran Bastan Museum, which was inaugurated in 1937 in Tehran.

Archaeology and archaeological institutions in Iran under Reza Shah

The abolition of the monopoly and its consequences

The creation of the National Museum in Tehran in March 1917 by Morteza Khan Momtaz al-Molk indirectly threatened the French monopoly. The Persian authorities, who wished to enrich this museum, insisted strongly that the monopoly should not be confined only to Susa, where all discoveries belonged to France, but that French archaeologists should excavate in other regions as well, where the discovered objects would be shared equally between the two countries.

Almost one year after the coup d'état of 21 February 1921, led by Seyyed Ziya' al-Din Tabataba'i and Reza Khan, according to the official records of the Pahlavi era, a few “intensely patriotic” men like Zoka' al-Molk (Mohammad 'Ali Foroughi), Hakim al-Molk (Ebrahim Hakimi), and Moshir al-Dowleh

130 Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam

(Hasan Pirniya) gathered and “spontaneously” formed a “cultural group” called the Society for National Heritage (*Anjoman-e asar-e melli*). Its aim was to “preserve, protect and promote Iran’s patrimony.”⁴¹ To achieve this goal, the Society concentrated its efforts in three fields: establishing a museum and a library in Tehran; ensuring the proper registration of all artefacts and monuments that were in need of protection as national heritage; preparing correct records of all antiquities in possession of the government and national organizations.⁴²

The Society for National Heritage also organized conferences and invited scholars, most notably among them the German archaeologist Ernst Herzfeld (1879–1948) and the American art historian Arthur Upham Pope (1881–1969), who gave various lectures for the Society. For example, in his presentation on 13 August 1925, which he delivered in French, Herzfeld outlined the importance of preserving historical monuments and their significance for the identity of a nation, and he concluded:

Those who consider preserving national remains should also take into account the question of excavations and discovery of antiquities, because important historical documents and fine treasures of antiquities are buried beneath the Iranian soil. Arrangements for excavations should therefore complement the preservation of national heritage, and the ensuing results should be exhibited in a National Museum to encourage public interest, so that Iranians can take advantage of them in their present technological development in order to revive and appreciate their civilization.⁴³

As for Arthur Upham Pope, on 22 April 1925 he gave a lecture on “The Past and Future of Persian Art.” The lecture was in English, translated into Persian for a large audience, including Reza Khan and some members of the government, the Parliament and the Society for National Heritage. Pope presented a survey of Iranian art from the Achaemenid to Sasanian and Islamic times, and stressed the cultural, artistic, and spiritual contribution of Iran to world civilization.⁴⁴ During this lengthy speech, Pope conveyed several politically current themes and concluded his speech with this phrase: “Art is a vital necessity of life for the Nation. ... The government and the people together must do everything possible to bring art again to life in Persia.”⁴⁵

Thus, the speeches given by Herzfeld and Pope, who were both against the French monopoly and actively present in Iran, more and more promoted the idea among the Persian elites that the monopoly should be abolished. Under these circumstances, the monopoly issue came up for discussion in the Iranian Parliament (*Majles*), where Hoseyn ‘Ala’ and Mohammad ‘Ali Foroughi argued that the *Majles* had every right to withdraw concessionary privileges if they had not been fully exploited.⁴⁶ A few months after this parliamentary debate, the formal end of the Qajar dynasty in December 1925 and the accession of the nationalist Reza Shah, who tried to abolish all concessions granted under the Qajars, threatened the French monopoly even further. How

did the French diplomacy respond to this situation? Official records in French Archives reveal that the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Public Instruction were prepared to make some sort of compromise that would salvage at least parts of their archaeological privilege.⁴⁷

By the end of 1926, Ernst Herzfeld was acting as archaeological adviser to the Iranian government. The government officially employed him to work as “a specialist in Oriental Studies” for three years with an annual income of 72.000 rials (then approximately £1500). As archaeological adviser, Herzfeld requested strict controls over all antiquities to be sent abroad, including objects discovered by the French mission at Susa. Roland de Mecquenem, director of this mission, complained about these measures.⁴⁸

Early in 1927, the Iranians appeared on the verge of appointing Herzfeld as Director of the Antiquities Service. The French minister in Tehran, Gaston Maugras, intervened at the last moment to thwart Herzfeld’s appointment. He told the court minister ‘Abdolhoseyn Teymurtash that the nomination of a German in this position could well end all hope of revising the archaeological monopoly. Teymurtash, who valued Herzfeld’s presence in Iran as a very strong weapon to get rid of the French monopoly, offered Maugras a way out of the impasse: Iran would be prepared to accept a French national as Director of the Antiquities Service in return for ending the monopoly. Maugras strongly advised his government to accept the proposal.⁴⁹

Finally, after long negotiations between the French and Iranian authorities, Mohammad Tadayyon,⁵⁰ Iranian minister of education, and Paul Ballereau,⁵¹ the French chargé d’affaires, in Tehran, signed an agreement on 18 October 1927. The French government gave up the monopoly over all excavations in Iran which had been granted to them through the convention of 1900, restricting it to the region of Susa where it would also be subject to the sharing of discoveries. In return, the Persian government agreed to hire a specialist, to be proposed by the French government, to act as Director of the Antiquities Service, as well as of the library and the museum, which would be established under his responsibility. This expert should carry out his duties for a period of at least twenty years under the authority of the responsible Iranian minister.⁵²

Shortly after the abolition of the monopoly, Herzfeld, who had not been able to obtain the position as Director of the Persian Antiquities Service, made plans to excavate at Pasargadae in April 1928. Accompanied by Friedrich Krefter, a young architect from Berlin, he set out for Fars. The exploration lasted 28 days, after which they went to Persepolis. But in the absence of any concrete regulations, excavations at Persepolis could not be carried out. Thus, in his capacity as archaeological adviser, Herzfeld’s first task was to convince the Iranian government to accept and approve a general law regulating excavation procedures, and then to apply such a law to the site of Persepolis. Soon he prepared a draft law and passed it on to the court minister Teymurtash. The latter ordered the minister of education, at that time Yahya Qaragozlu (E’temad al-Dowleh), to prepare a text based on this draft and to present it to the Parliament. Qaragozlu formed a committee with several high-ranking

132 Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam

Persian officials and European scholars, including Herzfeld, Pope, and André Godard, a French expert who had just arrived in Iran in order to serve as General Director of Antiquities.⁵³ This committee prepared a draft law consisting of twenty articles, which was ratified on 3 November 1930 by the National Consultative Assembly. According to this law, which in parts was a translation of the respective Austrian law, the Iranian government became for the first time responsible for the conservation and preservation of all antique objects up to the end of the Zand dynasty (1750–94). With regard to the importance of this first law on antiquities, which is still valid in Iran, its complete translation is given in the appendix.

The enthusiasm of members of the Persian elite for the conservation of their cultural heritage certainly played a considerable role in its protection. However, to protect and, more particularly, to repair the ancient monuments, first funds and second capable artisans and adequate building materials were needed. Mere expression of anguish and care did not protect these monuments against wind, rain, and sunlight. In the budget of the Ministry of Education, no provision at all had been made for the restoration of historical monuments. Only in Article 9 of the Law of Foundations (*owqaf*), which had been ratified in 1925, the amount of one twentieth of the revenue had been allocated as supervision right (*haqq al-nezareh*) to repair historical monuments and to renovate madrasas and shrines. This meagre sum could not meet the needs for conservation and restoration.⁵⁴

The abolition of the monopoly and the ratification of the first Antiquities Law opened the doors of ancient Persian sites to all foreign archaeologists, who for years had tried to obtain official permissions to carry out excavations. Thus, throughout the reign of Reza Shah, in addition to France, which continued its archaeological mission at Susa under Roland Mecquenem,⁵⁵ other countries, especially the United States, launched archaeological excavations all over Iran. Among these missions, the Oriental Institute excavations at Persepolis led by Ernst Herzfeld from 1931 to 1934 and by Erich Friedrich Schmidt from 1935 to 1939 proved to be of particular significance in promoting nationalist feelings in Iran. Reza Shah was a strong supporter of these excavations. He visited Persepolis for the first time as minister of war in 1922 – when he escorted Ahmad Shah into exile to his ship at Bushehr – and he was shocked by the deplorable state of the Achaemenid palaces. During his second visit in 1928, when he saw the Persepolis buildings, he was moved by “the glory of ancient Iranian monarchs” with their “colossal monuments” and delighted to learn that “such great kings have ruled Iran and left these magnificent remains.” After the beginning of the excavations at Persepolis, Reza Shah, who had already made the acquaintance of Herzfeld, ardently supported his work at the site and personally ensured that the project would run smoothly. In his third visit to the site in 1932, he told Herzfeld: “You are doing a work of civilization here, and I thank you.” In his fourth and last visit to Persepolis in March 1937, Reza Shah praised the work already accomplished and encouraged Erich Schmidt to work faster to clear the entire platform.⁵⁶

Other excavations carried out by foreign missions in Iran during Reza Shah's reign can be presented briefly in this way:

- Three expeditions sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania: at Turang Tappeh from 1931 to 1932 under Frederick R. Wulsin; Tappeh Hessar from 1931 to 1932; and Ray from 1934 to 1936, both under Erich F. Schmidt.
- Under the auspices of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, Schmidt also dug at Istakhr from 1935 to 1939, carried out the first aerial reconnaissance in western Iran from 1935 to 1937, and led one of the first expeditions to Lurestan in 1934–35 and 1937–38.
- The Oriental Institute in 1932 also sponsored excavations at Tall-e Bakun (only briefly explored by Herzfeld in 1928) under Alexander Langsdorff.
- The Metropolitan Museum of Art sponsored excavations at Qasr-e Abu Nasr in 1932 and 1933–34 under J. M. Upton. Furthermore, Aurel Stein conducted extensive surveys and some test excavations in southern and western Iran from 1932 to 1936.
- The Sino-Swedish expedition excavated at Shah Tappeh in 1933 under T. J. Arne.
- The French also expanded their activities by digging at Tappeh Giyan from 1931 to 1933 under Georges Contenau and Roman Ghirshman; Tappeh Sialk from 1933 to 1937 under Ghirshman; and Bishapur from 1935 to 1937 under Georges Salles and Ghirshman.⁵⁷

All these missions were carried out in cooperation with the Iranian Antiquities Service, which had been under the direction of a French expert since 1928. Let us explore who this expert was, how he had been chosen, and what he did as director of the Service.

André Godard at the head of Persian Antiquities and his competitors

Considering the political situation in Iran between the two world wars, the outcome of the negotiations of 1927 was a kind of victory for France which, against the growing influence of Germany, managed to keep its excavations at Susa and to have a French national hired as Director of Persian Antiquities. Why was it so important to hold this position? Maybe it is better to answer this question by quoting parts of a message that the French minister of foreign affairs sent to his colleague, the French minister of public instruction in Paris:

J'estime, comme M. Gaston Maugras, que la seule possibilité qui s'offre à nous de maintenir une partie de notre position traditionnelle sur le terrain archéologique consiste à revendiquer la direction des Service archéologiques et des fouilles pour un de nos compatriotes, en permettant aux autres nations d'entreprendre des recherches sous son autorité et son contrôle.⁵⁸

So the directorship of the Persian Antiquities Service was important for France because of the control it guaranteed over all archaeological activities in Iran. And it was for this reason that the French Foreign Ministry, in its negotiations with the Iranian government, insisted that the latter hired the French expert for a period of 20 years. The Iranian government accepted, and on 29 April 1928, the National Assembly in Iran voted for a bill authorizing the employment of a Frenchman for the management of the Persian Antiquities.⁵⁹ Then, in the same year, André Godard went to Persia to take up this position.⁶⁰ He had studied architecture at the School of Beaux-Arts in Paris, then led an archaeological expedition in Mesopotamia from February to December 1910. Due to the insistence of the Ottoman authorities, Godard had remained in Baghdad to work (1910–12) as the head of the city's Architecture Department. Ten years later, in December 1922, André Godard and his wife, Yedda Reuilly (1889–1977), a painter in watercolours and graduate of the National School of Oriental Languages, were attached to the French Archaeological Delegation in Afghanistan (DAFA), where between February and November 1923 they had, among other things, made plans of caves and copied their rock drawings.

André Godard was the only candidate for the position of Director of Persian Antiquities whose experience in the fields of Islamic art and Oriental antiquities allowed him to endear himself to the Iranian authorities and keep up with his German rival, Ernst Herzfeld. Herzfeld had worked as “a specialist in Oriental studies” for three years (1927–30) and had hoped to be appointed as the head of Persian Antiquities. But the negotiations between the Iranian and the French governments in the context of the abolishment of the monopoly did not allow him to achieve his goal. The great rival of Godard did not stay long in Iran because in November 1934, when the Crown Prince of Sweden, the later Gustav VI (r. 1955–73), and his wife unofficially visited Persepolis, Herzfeld, without any permission from the Iranian authorities, offered them two sculptured fragments of a Persian Immortal belonging to the eastern stairway of the Apadana and the Central Palace. Both fragments are now in the Museum of Mediterranean and Near Eastern Antiquities in Stockholm. Such a gift was not appreciated by the Iranian government, which firmly refused the continuation of Herzfeld’s excavations at Persepolis.⁶¹ Thus, in 1935, he was replaced by another German archaeologist, recently naturalized as American, Erich F. Schmidt, as field director of expeditions at Persepolis. Arthur Upham Pope played a considerable role in his nomination. The latter was another important rival of Godard. Among the foreign scholars who worked in Iran during the Pahlavi era, Pope was perhaps the most influential in promoting Iranian nationalism. From the 1920s until his death in 1969, this American educator, author, and ardent advocate of Persian art and architecture introduced and promoted Persian art and culture through publications, exhibitions, congresses, lectures, and graduate-level courses. He made his first trip to Iran in 1925. Three years later, he established the American Institute for Persian (later Iranian) Art and Archaeology in New York City. The Institute sponsored

several archaeological expeditions to Iran and a series of nine architectural surveys from 1929 to 1939, which primarily focused on recording and photographing pre-Islamic and Islamic monuments.⁶² Pope's best-known work, *A Survey of Persian Art*, appeared in 1938–39. It was a massive six-volume edition that consisted of 2817 lavishly printed pages of text (115 chapters in 69 sections), almost 1500 plates of 3500 photographs, 193 colour plates, and 1966 text illustrations. Most of the leading scholars of the day contributed to this monumental work, which was composed by 72 contributors from 16 different countries.⁶³ Arthur Upham Pope was a charismatic, yet controversial figure. He developed a close friendship with the Pahlavi family, and together with his wife, Phyllis Ackerman (1893–1977), served as adviser on and dealer of Iranian art for many museums and private collections.⁶⁴

Godard's nomination in 1928 in some way realized Jacques de Morgan's hopes. Thirty years earlier, in 1898, he had predicted that with the establishment of a museum in Tehran under French leadership, the archaeological interests of France in Persia would be protected.⁶⁵ Thus, it was in this context that André Godard directed the Persian Antiquities Service from 1928 to 1960, to be renamed in June 1937 as the General Service of Archaeology (*Edareh-ye Koll-e Bastanshenasi*).⁶⁶ Several examples demonstrate this perspective very clearly: after the discovery of bronzes in Luristan in 1928, Godard not only formed a collection for the Iranian National Museum, but also brought together a set that was acquired by the Louvre and by individuals, including David Weill, the Parisian collector.⁶⁷ Furthermore, in 1933, based on information from Godard, Roman Ghirshman excavated over three seasons at Tepe Sialk, which produced remarkable results.⁶⁸

As the director of the General Service of Archaeology, Godard concentrated his efforts on the task of systematically recording and preserving the country's ancient monuments. This was somehow a continuation of the first steps taken by Herzfeld in this field. He also initiated the publication of *Athar-e Iran: Annales du Service Archéologique de l'Iran*, published twice yearly in French from 1936 to 1949 (with interruptions between 1938 and 1949). Some fascicles were entirely devoted to pioneering studies on one topic. Each issue also came out in a Persian edition with a translation of the French text.⁶⁹ But probably the most important accomplishment that marks Godard's contribution to Iranian archaeology is the construction of the archaeological museum in Tehran, the *Muzeh-ye Iran Bastan*.

The Creation of the Iran Bastan Museum

On 11 May 1934, André Godard was officially asked to prepare the necessary plans for the construction of the new archaeological museum in Tehran. This formal request stipulated that the architectural design of the museum should be consistent with the history of ancient Persia and Persian civilization and culture.⁷⁰ Therefore, André Godard collaborated with his friend Maxime Siroux, an architect who had graduated from the École des Beaux-Arts in

136 Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam

Paris, in order to propose a plan inspired by Sassanid architecture.⁷¹ More precisely, the pediment of the museum was modelled on the famous *Taq-e Kasra* in Ctesiphon and the red burgundy colour, typical of Sasanian architecture, was chosen for the facade of the museum building. This plan was accepted by the Iranian authorities, in particular the Shah. It seems that Arthur Pope played a decisive role in choosing the Sasanian front of the Museum. Pope's influence on Reza Shah Pahlavi resulted also in the construction of other new buildings such as Qasr-e Marmar (the "Marble Palace") in Tehran with a tiled dome in the style of Esfahan's Sheykh Lotfollah Mosque, and the main office of *Bank-e Mellî-ye Iran* (the "National Bank of Iran") and Tehran's police headquarters in Achaemenid style.⁷²

Once the plan was accepted, the museum was built on a terrain of 5500 m². The work took about three years (1934–37) to be completed. The inauguration of this building, which was named *Muzeh-ye Iran Bastan*, was held in 1937.⁷³ It is interesting to know that in the same year, Reza Shah visited Susa for the third time and that this visit provided the opportunity for a royal outburst against the rapaciousness of the French "thieves" who had taken all the treasures to the Louvre and left Iran only the cement. He had long known about this "thievery" of course, but his words seemed carefully chosen at this time to signal his overall displeasure to Paris.⁷⁴ For several reasons, relations between France and Iran cooled down at that particular time: according to the French, it was the result of Tehran's rapprochement with Nazi Germany. But, in reality, it was rather the Franco-Soviet pact from May 1935 and the Front Populaire taking office in France in June 1936 that frightened Reza Shah, who already saw Bolshevism dominate the French Republic.⁷⁵ In addition, Reza Shah was angry with France because French newspapers had criticized him and his kingdom severely for two years. A first critical article on Iran, published in November 1936 in the *Revue de France*, described the country as dirty and miserable and wished for Iran to become colonized or turned into a protectorate. Another article, written by A. Montgon in *Le Petit Bleu*, dated 21 January 1937, criticized Reza Shah as follows: "Ce souverain qui se targue d'être moderne ne voudra pas qu'il soit dit que si l'on gratte le chah on trouve le cosaque".⁷⁶ Following these criticisms, despite the efforts of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs for an apology and the publication of flattering articles, Reza Shah recalled the Iranian ambassador from Paris. Diplomatic relations were thus interrupted for several months in 1938–39. Iranian students holding scholarships in France were recalled and running contracts with France were stalled. Despite these firm decisions taken by the Iranian government, André Godard's contract was not cancelled and he could continue to exercise his functions and to organize the new museum, created despite the economic difficulties of the Iranian government.

The Iran Bastan soon became the principal Iranian archaeological museum. The antiquities that were previously stored in the former National Museum, created by Momtaz al-Molk in 1917, were transferred to this new museum where up to the present day both excavated objects from the

ancient periods of Iranian history and art works from the Islamic period are on display.

After the creation of *Muzeh-ye Iran Bastan*, perhaps one of the most significant developments in Iranian archaeology during the reign of Reza Shah was the establishment of the Department of Archaeology at Tehran University in 1937. We were unable to find any detailed information concerning the relationship between this new department and the General Service of Archaeology. We only know that André Godard was influential in setting up the teaching program of this department and also that of the Faculty of Fine Arts. Students who graduated from the Department of Archaeology collaborated with the General Service of Archaeology. The first student to graduate in 1941 from this department was Fereydun Tavallali (1919–85) who went on to pursue his career in archaeology in Fars, which included the first series of excavations at Malian (46 km north of Shiraz) – although he is better known for his literary works. Among the early instructors at the Department of Archaeology were also two scholars who played important roles in promoting Iranian nationalism: Mohammad Sadeq Kiya and Ebrahim Purdavud.⁷⁷

After World War II, Mohammad-Taqi Mostafavi, Godard's assistant, became Director of the Archaeological Service of Iran, while Godard became Director General. Godard's reputation was, however, soon diminished by rumours about his involvement in the illegal trade in antiquities, especially in the most scandalous "Ziviyeh affair."⁷⁸ He finally retired, and in 1960 left Iran for good. He died five years later in Paris.⁷⁹

Conclusion

During the second half of the nineteenth century, in an atmosphere of intense rivalry between the great Western museums who were obsessively concerned with access to and control over Oriental antiques, France prevailed over its competitors by obtaining an archaeological monopoly in Persia. The two Qajar Shahs who had granted this privilege hoped this would benefit their kingdom with half of all archaeological discoveries being exhibited in a national museum. Contrary to accepted wisdom, they received no money and they did not grant this privilege as a concession; they signed the archaeological conventions based on the allocation of equal shares of discoveries. Nevertheless, as we saw in this chapter, the mission led by Marcel Dieulafoy and the delegation led by Jacques de Morgan, each in its own way, violated the terms of this sharing agreement and brought all the discoveries to France. It is true that the excavations carried out by the French missions and the studies later accomplished on these discoveries significantly clarified the past of both historic and prehistoric Persia and brought about a growing interest in this country. However, as the price for this knowledge, Iran was deprived of a part of its heritage for the benefit of the Louvre and other great French national museums. In other words, a historical and national identity was revealed, but it was removed, housed, and exhibited far away from its original place.

Administratively, the French monopoly delayed the creation of archaeological organizations such as the National Museum and the Antiquities Service in Iran. However, again, contrary to accepted wisdom, the creation of these organizations does not date from the reign of Reza Shah Pahlavi, because as we saw in this chapter, they were established for the first time in Iran shortly after the Constitutional Revolution of 1906 to protect the country's heritage. Nevertheless, these efforts were of a fleeting nature for several reasons, including the lack of a legal basis and funding, which prevented them from reaching their goal. It was necessary to wait until 1925 and the rise of Reza Shah who two years after his accession, in October 1927, abolished the French monopoly. Thus, the new monarch plucked the fruit of a process that had already begun with the end of the reign of the last Qajars. But this reality was never mentioned, or even taken into consideration, in almost all of the studies concerning the history of archaeology in Iran. Actually, because it was official Pahlavi policy to downplay and besmirch the image of Qajar rule, the history of archaeology and archaeological institutions in Iran were also targeted by this policy.

The abolition of the French monopoly, the ratification of the Antiquities Law in 1930, and the measures taken thereafter opened up new horizons for Persian antiquities, the art market, and the foreign archaeological missions in Persia. However, we should remember that Reza Shah, who consolidated his power by drawing on rising nationalist feelings in Iran, sparked already by the Constitutional Revolution, was also surrounded by several patriotic intellectuals who initiated the protection of Iran's heritage with and through the creation of the Society for National Heritage. Some of these intellectuals, such as Hasan Pirniya Moshir al-Dowleh or Mohammad-'Ali Foroughi Zoka' al-Molk, actually profiting from the archaeological studies conducted by the French missions, have written substantial and memorable books on the history of Iran and clarified considerably the ancient period of Persian culture. These history books served as textbooks at high school level and in universities for the next decades.

The French archaeological works in Iran enabled the Iranians to rediscover their history, which up to that point had been interspersed with myths and legends, in a scientific manner. This discovery reinforced nationalist sentiments in Iran during Reza Shah's reign, in particular among the intellectuals who criticized more and more the invasion of the Arabs and the arrival of Islam in Iran. In this atmosphere, it is not astonishing to realize that the governmental archaeological institutions paid much more attention to Achaemenid and Sasanian monuments, in comparison with Iranian heritage from Islamic times.

Moreover, since Iran did not materially benefit from the French archaeological monopoly, Iranian nationalist feelings were raised once more. The Iranian intellectuals, generally educated in Europe, held the Qajars responsible for yielding these cultural treasures to France for ridiculous prices, once they saw their national antiquities displayed in the Louvre. This contempt for the Qajars prevented them, at least during the reign of the Pahlavis, from reaching an objective assessment of the history of archaeology in Iran. Therefore, it

was said and repeated that the Qajars gave the “concession of archaeological excavations (*emtiyaz-e hafriyat-e bastanshenasi*)” to France; however, there were no concessions, but only bilateral conventions, based on the equal division of discoveries. Did not the agreement over the abolition of the monopoly in October 1927, approved by Reza Shah, allow France to maintain the exclusive privilege of the excavations at Susa, based on the equitable sharing of discoveries? The answer to this question allows us to better understand the cultural policies and diplomacy during Reza Shah’s reign and to erase from our minds the clichés and ideas that do not correspond to the truth.

It is true that the abolition of the French monopoly by Reza Shah opened up a new page in the history of archaeology in Iran. But we must also admit that during the reign of this monarch no coherent and serious program for the protection of Iranian heritage was ever developed, although he was such a fierce nationalist. Witness the fate of the Society for National Heritage: in 1934, following the celebrations of the Ferdowsi’s millennium and the unveiling of his mausoleum at Tus, the Society was suspended by Reza Shah, to resume work only in 1943.

As a final remark, one can state that during the reign of Reza Shah the archaeological sites, including the ruins of Persepolis and the buildings of the Sasanian era which recalled the greatness of Iran in ancient times, were protected and studied by foreign missions, with the cost of abandoning the Islamic antiquities. Three factors contributed to this predicament: Reza Shah, who regarded himself as a monarch at the head of a kingdom once ruled by Cyrus and Darius; the Iranian intellectuals, who nostalgically looked for the historical greatness of Iran in the archaeological sites and encouraged vigorously the “de-Arabization” of the Persian language and Iranian culture; and finally, the foreign archaeological missions, who, trained in the classicist tradition, were primarily interested in ancient Persia and thus indirectly led the Iranians to discard their Islamic heritage in favour of discovering their history before the arrival of Islam. These three factors together strongly influenced the cultural policy of the Iranian government during the reign of Reza Shah.

Appendix

Law concerning the preservation of national antiquities

Approved on 12 Aban 1309 [3 November 1930]:⁸⁰

Article 1 – All works of art produced in Iran, whether movable or immovable, as well as all historical sites and buildings, dating from before the end of the Zand dynasty, are by virtue of Article 3 of the present law, considered as national antiquities (*asar-e melli*) and are placed under the protection and control of the State.

Article 2 – The State will draw up an inventory of all Iranian antiquities currently known and identified, which are of specific historical, scientific or

140 Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam

artistic interest. Any further antiquities of the same kind discovered in the future will be added to this inventory. The inventory once completed will be printed and made known to the public.

Article 3 – The listing of property in the Inventory of National Antiquities will be announced by means of an order from the Ministry of Education (*Vezarat-e Ma'aref*). However, property belonging to a private person will only be listed when the owner has been notified in advance and will become effective only when any protest the owner might raise has been considered. The owner does not have to assume the obligations set forth in this law until the listing of the property has become effective.

Article 4 – The owner of immovable property which, under the provisions of the present law, may be considered as a national antiquity, as well as any person coming to know of the existence of property of this kind must notify the nearest appropriate government office so that the relevant authorities, as defined in the application rules (*nezam-nameh*) to the present law, can decide whether the property in question should be considered as a national antiquity and classified as such.

Article 5 – Private individuals who are owners or in possession of properties listed in the inventory of national antiquities can retain their right of ownership or possession but may not oppose measures which the state considers necessary for the preservation of those antiquities. If work undertaken by the State entails expenditure, no reimbursement of that expenditure may be claimed from the owner, nor shall the work in question in any way affect his right of ownership.

Article 6 – The acts listed below are forbidden. Any person who performs such acts will be tried and fined from 50 to 1000 toman. In addition, he could also be held liable for the cost of the damage caused by him to national antiquities:

- a) Destroying or damaging national antiquities, covering them with plaster or paint, or carving designs or inscriptions on them.
- b) Undertaking works near national antiquities which could damage their structure or modify their appearance.
- c) Appropriating, buying or selling items or materials belonging to listed buildings without the authorization of the state. The repair and restoration of buildings classified as national antiquities and belonging to private owners may only be undertaken with the authorization of the state and under its supervision. Any infringement is punishable as described above.

Article 7 – Privately owned movable properties considered as national antiquities must be listed in a separate inventory, in accordance with Article 3 of the present law.

Article 8 – For each item of movable property listed in the inventory of national antiquities, a descriptive certificate must be drawn up in duplicate, indicating its place of origin and how it was discovered. One or more photographs should be attached. One copy of the certificate will be kept in

the national antiquities archives and the other will be delivered free of charge to the owner. This copy must accompany the property in every exchange of ownership. A change of ownership in no way affects the status of the property as a listed national antiquity.

Article 9 – If the owner of a listed property wishes to sell it to a third party, he must notify the appropriate public authorities in writing. If the state wishes this property to be included in a national collection, it has the right of pre-emption but must give notice to the owner of its intention to exercise that right within ten days of receiving the owner's notification. If the state gives no such notice, the owner is free to sell the property to another client. In all cases and whatever the means by which the property has been disposed of, the previous owner must notify the state within ten days of the transfer and provide the name and address of the new owner.

Anyone who sells a listed property without notifying the Ministry of Education or its representatives will be fined a sum equal to the sale price of the property in question. In addition, the state may seize the property which has been sold, reimbursing the purchaser the sum paid by him. Furthermore, if the purchaser knew that the property in question was listed in the inventory of national antiquities, but still proceeded with the purchase, he shall be liable to the same fine as the seller, unless he himself notified the state.

Article 10 – Any person happening to discover any movable property which, according to the provisions of the present law, could be considered as a national antiquity, even if that property was found on his own land, must notify the Ministry of Education or one of its representatives as soon as possible. Should the relevant public authorities decide that the movable property in question ought to be listed in the inventory of national antiquities, half of the property discovered, or of its value as determined by assessment, shall be due to the finder. The state may, at its own discretion, decide whether to retain the other half or donate it to the finder.

Article 11 – Excavations and diggings to extract national antiquities are the exclusive right of the state. The state may use this right directly, or delegate it by special authorization, to academic institutions, societies or individuals. Such authorization must indicate the site of the excavations, their extent and estimated duration. In addition, the state is entitled to make probes in any place where remains have been found, or where evidence suggests the existence of remains, or which seems likely to conceal remains, for the purpose of discovering antiquities and determining their nature and quality.

Article 12 – Excavations whose sole purpose is to discover antiquities or to conduct academic research are termed “scientific excavations”. Excavations whose purpose is the sale of antiquities are termed “commercial excavations”. Authorization to undertake scientific excavations is granted exclusively to academic institutions. Commercial excavations in listed buildings or in listed immovable properties are prohibited.

Article 13 – Excavations on land belonging to private individuals may be undertaken only with the authorization of the state and with the consent of

142 *Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam*

the owner. However, the owner of a site listed in the inventory of national antiquities or which the state, as a result of probes, has listed or is in the process of listing in the inventory cannot withhold his consent. He is entitled only to request an indemnity which shall be equivalent to the lowest average rent from the land which is no longer available to him on account of the excavations, as well as the compensation for damages caused and for expenses incurred in restoring the land to its original state after the excavations.

Article 14 – Items discovered during scientific or commercial excavations, at one and the same site during one and the same period of excavations, belong exclusively to the state if the state has itself undertaken the excavations. If the excavations have been undertaken by a third party, the state may select and appropriate up to ten items of historical or artistic value and donate half of the remainder to the finder, keeping the other half itself. If there are not more than ten items altogether and if the state keeps them all, the expenses incurred by the excavations are reimbursed to the person who provided the funds. Buildings and parts of buildings are not covered by the above provisions regarding sharing and the state is entitled to appropriate them in toto.

Note: One period of excavations is defined as one which lasts no longer than a year.

Article 15 – Items discovered during scientific excavations and to which the state is entitled must be kept in national collections and museums. They are inalienable. Items donated to the finder become his sole property. Of the items discovered during commercial excavations which revert to the state, the state keeps all those of interest to museums and disposes of the others as it so chooses. The sale of such items shall be by auction.

Article 16 – Any person infringing on the provisions of Article 10, or undertaking excavations, even on his own property, without State authorization or without the knowledge of the state, or exporting antiquities illegally, will be fined from 20 to 2000 toman. In addition, the items discovered will be confiscated by the state. Earth removal and other works of the same type not undertaken for the purpose of finding antiquities are not subject to the above-mentioned fines.

Article 17 – Persons wishing to trade in antiquities must obtain a state license. A state license is also required to export antiquities. Any item listed in the inventory of national antiquities will be confiscated by the State if any attempt is made to export it without state authorization. The state will not refuse export licenses for items which, under the provisions of Articles 10 and 14 of the present law, are the property of the finder, provided that they are not listed in the inventory of national antiquities. If they are listed items, the conditions under which they may be exported are set out in Article 18 below.

Article 18 – The state is entitled to refuse an export license for items considered as national antiquities and to purchase them at the price declared by the person concerned in his request for an export license. If the owner refuses to sell them at the stated price, the export license will not be granted. If the license is granted, an export tax will be levied equal to 5 per cent of the value

determined by the state-appointed assessor. In the event of disagreement between the owner and the assessor, the matter will be settled by a special commission, the composition of which will be determined by the rules for the application of the present law.

The export tax provided for by the present Article is independent of the customs levies laid down for such items by the customs tariffs in force. The export of items discovered during scientific excavations undertaken with the agreement of the state and constituting the finder's share is authorized in all cases and is exempt from any levies and taxes.

Article 19 – The Council of Ministers will draw up and approve rules for the implementation of this law, stating the conditions for trading in antiquities and the conditions for the implementation of all the provisions of the present law.

Article 20 – Authorizations for excavations already granted which do not comply with the present law are hereby revoked.

This law, which consists of twenty articles, was adopted on 12 Aban 1309 [3 November 1930] by the National Consultative Assembly.

President of the National Consultative Assembly – Dadgar⁸¹

List of abbreviations

ADMAE:	<i>Archives Diplomatiques du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères</i> (Diplomatic Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Paris)
AN:	<i>Archives Nationales</i> (French National Archives, Paris)
BAVOKI:	<i>Baygani-ye Vezarat-e omur-e kharejeh-ye Iran</i> (Archives of the Iranian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tehran)
BRMFOT:	<i>Baygani-ye raked-e Miras-e Farhangi-ye Ostan-e Tehran</i> (Archives of the Organization for Cultural Heritage, Tehran Province)
IME:	Iranian Ministry of Education (<i>Vezarat-e ma'aref va owqaf va sanaye'-e mostazafeh</i>)
IMFA:	Iranian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (<i>Vezarat-e omur-e kharejeh</i>)
MAE:	<i>Ministère des Affaires Etrangères</i> (French Ministry of Foreign Affairs)

Notes

* This article is based, inter alia, on the documents of archives housed in several locations. I thank the directors of these archives who gave me access to their invaluable documents concerning the history of Iranian archaeology. I am grateful to Dr. Ali Mousavi, who gave me his article about Ernst Herzfeld and provided some references. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Willem Floor, who read an early draft of this paper and kindly advised me on some details.

1 Eugène Flandin and Pascal Coste, *Voyage en Perse, pendant les années 1840 et 1841*, 8 vols. (Paris: Baudry, 1843–54).

144 Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam

- 2 William Kennett Loftus, *Travels and Researches in Chaldaea and Susiana, with an Account of Excavations at Warka, the "Erech" of Nimrod, and Shushan, "Shushan the Palace" of Esther in 1849–52* (London: James Nisbet, 1857). Idem., “On the Excavations undertaken at the Ruins of Susa in 1851–52,” *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom*, second series, vol. V (London: John Murray, 1856), pp. 422–53.
- 3 Jane Dieulafoy, *A Suse; journal des fouilles 1884–1886* (Paris: Hachette, 1888).
- 4 Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam, *L'archéologie française en Perse et les antiquités nationales (1884–1914)* (Paris: Connaissances et Savoirs, 2004), pp. 45–57.
- 5 Ibid., pp. 91–122.
- 6 Ibid., pp. 135–46.
- 7 Ibid., pp. 169–95.
- 8 *Mozakerat-e majles, dowreh-ye avval-e taqniniya* (Tehran, n.d.), pp. 113–14.
- 9 Nasiri-Moghaddam, *L'archéologie française*, pp. 289–90.
- 10 This inaccuracy first occurred in the article by Mohammad-Taqi Mostafavi (1955), who relied on the incorrect memories of a former employee of the Antiquities Service. This mistake was repeated in almost all subsequent works concerned with the history of archaeological institutions in Iran. Only Mehdi Hodjat, the former director of the Cultural Heritage Organization of Iran, in his doctoral thesis, written in English, did not fall into this trap and correctly stated that the Antiquities Service was founded in 1910. However, despite his access to the Archives of the Cultural Heritage Organization, Hodjat neither mentioned the exact date of the creation of this Service, nor reviewed its functions or the process of its dissolution. See Mohammad-Taqi Mostafavi, “Talash dar rah-e khedmat be asar-e melli va omid be ayandeh,” *Gozaresha-ye bastanshenasi* 3 (1334/1955), pp. 367–513: 387; Mehdi Hodjat, *Cultural Heritage in Iran: Policies for an Islamic Country*, Ph.D. dissertation (York: University of York, 1995), pp. 164–65; Gholamreza Ma’sumi, “Shamma’i az pishineh-ye bastanshenasi-ye Iran va eqdamat-e anjam shodeh dar panjah sal-e shahanshahi-ye Pahlavi,” *Barrasi-ha-ye tarikhi* no. 64, 11,4 (1355/1976), pp. 53–106: 84; Sadeq Malek Shahmirzadi, “Barrasi-ye tahavvolat-e motale‘at-e bastanshenasi dar Iran,” in *Majmu‘eh-ye maqalat-e anjomvareh-ye barrasi-ye masa’el-e iranshenasi*, ed. ‘Ali Musavi Garmarudi (Tehran: Daftari-e motale‘at-e siyasi va beyn al-melali, 1371/1992), pp. 373–447: 408; Mahmud Musavi, “Bastanshenasi dar panjehsali ke gozasht,” *Miras-e farhangi* 2 (1369/1990), pp. 6–17: 9; Idem., “Bastanshenasi dar jahan-e eslami,” in *Danesh-nameh-ye jahan-e eslami*, ed. Mostafa Mirsalim, 2nd edition (Tehran: Bonyad-e da’erat al-ma{rsquo;aref-e eslami, 1375/1996), pp. 493–511: 495–96; ‘Ezzatollah Negahban, *Moruri bar panjah sal-e bastanshenasi-ye Iran* (Tehran: Sazman-e Miras-e Farhangi-ye Keshvar, 1376/1997), p. 56.
- 11 BRMFOT, 1289 *shamsil/fayl-e 1* [ministerial decree, 1^{er} Jomadi al-avval 1328 (11 May 1910)]. Iraj Mirza Jalal al-Mamalek (1874–1925), the famous poet in the history of Persian contemporary literature, was the son of Gholam-Hoseyn Mirza Sadr al-Sho‘ara, himself a Qajar court poet and descended from Fath-‘Ali Shah Qajar, Mahdi Bamdad, *Sharh-e hal-e rejal-e Iran: dar qarn-e 12 va 13 va 14 hejri*, 4th edition (Tehran: Zavvar, 1371/1992), vol. 1, pp. 174–75.
- 12 Morteza-Qoli Khan Hedayat (1856–1911), who held the title of Sani‘ al-Dowleh, son-in-law of Mozaffar al-Din Shah, studied in Germany from 1876 to 1891. After the victory of the constitutionalists in Iran, he chaired the first National Consultative Assembly until 31 August 1907. Then he assumed repeatedly the positions of minister of education and minister of finance before being assassinated on 6 February 1911, Bamdad, *Sharh-e hal-e rejal*, vol. 4, pp. 63–69.
- 13 Nasiri-Moghaddam, *L'archéologie française*, pp. 290–93.
- 14 *Mozakerat-e Majles, dowreh-ye dovvom-e taqniniya*, pp. 790–93, 1107. ADMAE, *Nouvelle Série/Persé/43*, f 245 [Poulpiquet du Halgouet to MAE, 11/2/1911].

- 15 *Mozakerat-e Majles, dowreh-ye dovvom-e taqniniya*, pp. 790–93, 844–48, 859–64, 1392–1410.
- 16 “E’lan-e vezarat-e ma’aref va owqaf,” announcement by the Iranian Ministry of Education, dated 23 Shavval 1329/17 October 1911, published in *Ruz-nameh-ye rasmi-ye dowlat-e Iran*, 25 Shavval 1329 (19 October 1911), no. 65, p. 1.
- 17 Nasiri-Moghaddam, *L’archéologie française*, pp. 296–99.
- 18 BRMFOT, 1291 shamsilfayl-e 1 [IME to IMFA, 26 Shawval 1330 (8 October 1912)]; BRMFOT, 1291 shamsilfayl-e 1 [IMFA to IME, 3 Ziqā-deh 1330 (15 October 1912)]; BRMFOT, 1291 shamsilfayl-e 1 [IME to IMFA, 14 Ziqā-da 1330 (26 October 1912)].
- 19 BRMFOT, 1291 shamsilfayl-e 1 [project presented on 27 Zihajeh 1330 (7 December 1912)].
- 20 BAVOKI, 1330 qamari/karton-e 44/parvandeh-ye 7 [IME to IMFA, 27 Zihijja 1330 (7 December 1912)].
- 21 ADMAE, *Nouvelle Série/Persé/44*, f 160–61 [R. Lecomte to MAE, 3/5/1913].
- 22 Ebrahim Hakimi (1871–1959), titled Hakim al-Molk, after having studied medicine in Paris (1895), became the most influential doctor at Mozaffar al-Din Shah’s court. However, after a dosage error in medication administered to the Shah, Hakim al-Molk did not practice medicine any longer and became interested in administrative affairs. Member of the first two National Assemblies (*Majles*) of 1907 and of 1909, Hakim al-Molk was four times minister of the public instruction between August 1915 and January 1918. He also assumed the functions of the minister of finance, justice, foreign affairs, and court and finally became prime minister: Bamdad, *Sharh-e hal-e rejāl*, vol. 1, pp. 8–10.
- 23 BRMFOT, 1293 shamsilfayl-e 1 [IME to the Council of Ministers, 26 Jumadi al-avval 1332 (23 April 1914)].
- 24 Dr. Hoseyn Khan Amini, a former Chaldean priest who had converted to Islam, knew many languages (Latin, Syrian, French, English, and Arabic) and was also an expert in deciphering ancient inscriptions. After the arrival of André Godard in 1928, Hoseyn Khan continued his activities in the Persian Antiquities Service, while working with the French archaeologist. See Sadeq Malek Shahmirzadi, “Eshareh-i mokhtasar bar tashkilat-e bastanshenasi dar Iran,” *Asar*, nos. 12–14 (1365/1986), pp. 133–60:159.
- 25 *Grand Larousse universel* (Paris, 1995), vol. 10, p. 7199.
- 26 *Ruz-nameh-ye Iran*, announcement no. 290, published 9 Rabi‘ al-sani 1294 (16 July 1876). Sani‘ al-Dowleh was the title of Mohammad-Hasan Khan, who later obtained the title of E’temad al-Saltaneh.
- 27 Yahya Zoka’, *Tarikhcheh-ye sakhtemanha-ye Arg-e Sultanati-ye Tehran va rahnama-ye Kakh-e Golestan* (Tehran: Anjoman-e asar-e melli, 1349/1970), p. 123.
- 28 Ibid., p. 126.
- 29 Ibid., p. 122–43.
- 30 S. G. W. Benjamin, *Persia and the Persians* (Boston: Ticknor, 1887), p. 73.
- 31 George N. Curzon, *Persia and the Persian Question*, 2nd edition (London: Routledge, 1966), vol. 1, p. 314.
- 32 Claude Anet, *Les roses d’Ispahan: La Perse en automobile à travers la Russie et le Caucase* (Paris: F. Juven, 1906), p. 173.
- 33 AN, F/17/17245, dossier II [J. de Morgan to MIP, 29/10/1897].
- 34 ADMAE, *Nouvelle Série/Persé/42*, f 104 [Souhart to MAE, 19/1/1900].
- 35 ADMAE, *Nouvelle Série/Persé/43*, f 100–102 [Maximilien de La Martinière, French minister in Tehran to MAE, 22/7/1907].
- 36 AN, F/17/2993/C, dossier IV [J. de Morgan to MIP, 28/1/1910].
- 37 AN, F/17/2993/C, dossier III [J. de Morgan to Maximilien de La Martinière, 17/8/1907]: “To create a museum in Tehran and put some of our findings there would be to renounce our exclusive monopoly. This would open the door to requests

146 Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam

- coming from the Shah and the Persians, and thus give rise to difficulties which inevitably sooner or later would lessen our rights.”
- 38 Morteza Khan Momtaz al-Molk (1865–1925), pageboy in Naser al-Din Shah’s court, became an official in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and obtained the post of plenipotentiary minister in the United States (1906–8). From 4 March 1916 till 29 May 1917, he was minister of education. During this period Momtaz al-Molk created the first national museum in Iran. He was nominated for the second time as minister of education from 18 June till 7 August 1918. Then, Momtaz al-Molk assumed the post of minister of justice (14 February – 14 June 1923) and that of Director of the Russian Discount Bank (*estegrazi*) in Teheran (1924). See Zahra Shajii, *Nokhbegin-e siyasi-ye Iran: az engelab-e mashrutiyyat ta engelab-e eslami* (Tehran: Sokhan, 1372/1993), vol. 3, pp. 104–8, 115–17, 143–45; Bamdad, *Sharh-e hal-e rejai*, vol. 4, pp. 61–62.
- 39 Hodjat, *Cultural Heritage in Iran*, p. 174. It should be observed that on the binding of the museum catalogue, the date of creation is mentioned as Jomadi al-avval 1335/March 1917, while some studies indicate the year 1916. See *Nezam-nameh va katalog-e muze-hye melli-ye Iran* (Tehran, 1295/1917); Sadeq Malek Shahmirzadi, “Naqsh-e muze-ha dar ta’lim va tarbiyat,” *Miras-e farhangi*, II, 3–4 (1370/1992), pp. 45–48.
- 40 *Nezam-nameh va katalog*, pp. 5–6.
- 41 *Asas-nameh-ye Anjoman-e asar-e melli* (Tehran, 1301/1922). For more information about this Society, see Talinn Grigor, “Recultivating ‘Good Taste’: The Early Pahlavi Modernists and Their Society for National Heritage,” *Iranian Studies*, 37/1 (2004), pp. 17–45.
- 42 Kamyar Abdi, “Nationalism, Politics, and the Development of Archaeology in Iran,” *American Journal of Archaeology*, 105/1 (2001), pp. 51–76: 56.
- 43 Ernst Herzfeld, “Asar-e melli-e Iran,” in *Majmu’eh-ye entesharat-e qadim-e Anjoman-e asar-e melli* (Tehran: Anjoman-e asar-e melli, 1351/1973), pp. 29–44: 44. See also Ali Mousavi, “Ernst Herzfeld, Politics, and Antiquities Legislation in Iran,” in *Ernst Herzfeld and the Development of Near Eastern Studies, 1900–1950*, ed. Ann C. Gunter and Stefan Hauser (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 445–75: 450–51.
- 44 Abdi, “Nationalism, Politics, and the Development of Archaeology in Iran,” p. 60.
- 45 Arthur U. Pope, “The Past and Future of Persian Art,” delivered 22 April 1925 in Tehran. For the complete English text of the speech, see Jay Gluck and Noël Siver, ed., *Surveyors of Persian Art: A Documentary Biography of Arthur Upham Pope and Phyllis Ackerman* (Ashiya: SoPA, 1996), pp. 93–110: 110; also Grigor, “Recultivating ‘Good Taste’”, pp. 31–32.
- 46 James F. Goode, *Negotiating for the Past: Archaeology, Nationalism, and Diplomacy in the Middle East, 1919–1941* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007), p. 135.
- 47 AN, F/17/17245, dossier IV & mip to MAE, 30/7/1925].
- 48 Mousavi, “Ernst Herzfeld, Politics, and Antiquities Legislation in Iran,” pp. 454–55.
- 49 AN, F/17/17245, dossier IV [MAE to MIP, 10/1/1927]; Goode, *Negotiating for the Past*, p. 138.
- 50 Mohammad Tadayyon (1881–1951) occupied the post of the minister of education from 8 February 1927 to 8 January 1928, see Shajii, *Nokhbegin-e siyasi-ye Iran*, vol. 3, pp. 162–63.
- 51 Paul Arthur Ballereau, born on 12 June 1880, student of the *École des Langues orientales*, assumed from 25 October 1926 until 1 August 1928 the post of “chargé d’affaires” at the French Legation in Tehran. See *Annuaire diplomatique ... pour 1929 et 1930*, nouvelle série, t. XXXIX, (Paris, 1930), p. 204.
- 52 ADMAE, *Ancienne Série/18–40/Perse-Iran/66*, f 77–78 [Agreement between Iran and France, 18/10/1927].
- 53 For more information about Godard and his activities in Iran, see below.
- 54 Hodjat, *Cultural Heritage in Iran*, p. 183.

- 55 Roland de Mecquenem and Father Jean Vincent Scheil jointly directed the French archaeological mission at Susa until World War II, which interrupted this mission for a few years. On 22 September 1940, Father Scheil died and was succeeded by Georges Contenau as director of publications. In 1946, Roman Ghirshman took over the place of Roland de Mecquenem as director of the French archaeological mission at Susa. Ghirshman was replaced in 1968 by Jean Perrot, who led the French excavations at Susa until 1979, when they were stopped by the new government of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Thus, only the two world wars and the Islamic Revolution in 1979 interrupted about a century of French archaeological works in Susa.
- 56 Abdi, "Nationalism, Politics, and the Development of Archaeology in Iran," p. 60.
- 57 Ibid., p. 59. Cf. Louis Vanden Berghe, *Archéologie de l'Iran ancien* (Leiden: Brill, 1966), pp. 199–201. For more information about these archaeological missions in the Iranian archives, see Ruhollah Bahrami and 'Isa 'Abdi, ed., *Asnadi az bastanshenasi dar Iran: hafriyat, 'atiqat va banaha-ye tarikhi* (Tehran: Vezarat-e farhang va ershad-e eslamii, Sazman-e chap va entesharat, 1380/2001); also Davud Karimlu, ed., *Taraj-e miras-e melli*, vol. 2 (Tehran: Daftar-e motale'at-e siyasi va beyn al-melali 1381/2002); also Marziyeh Yazdani, ed., *Asnad-e hey'at-ha-ye bastanshenasi dar Iran* (Tehran: Sazman-e asnad-e melli-ye Iran, 1380/2001). Mohammad Gholi Majd in his book entitled *The Great American Plunder of Persia's Antiquities 1925–1941* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2003) explores the history of American involvement in Iranian archaeology during Reza Shah's reign, based on the US State Department archives. See the review of this book in *Iranian Studies* 37 (2004), pp. 737–42.
- 58 AN, F/17/17245, dossier IV [MAE to MIP, 10/1/1927]: "I agree with Mr. Gaston Maugras that the only option for us to keep some of our archaeological privileges in Iran is to claim the directorship of the Antiquities Service and the archaeological excavations for one of our compatriots, allowing other nations to carry out excavation and research under his authority and control."
- 59 ADMAE, *Ancienne Série/18–40/Perse-Iran/66*, f 95 [Telegram of the French Legation to MAE, 30/4/1928].
- 60 Raymond Lebègue, "Éloge funèbre de M. André Godard, correspondant de l'Académie," *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, comptes rendus des séances de l'année 1965*, pp. 453–54.
- 61 Herzfeld, being of Jewish descent, chose not to return to Germany in 1934 and went from Iran to London for a year, before in 1935 he was formally expelled from his chair at the University at Berlin. He joined the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton in 1936, from which he retired in 1944 at the age of 65. After World War II, he left the US and went to Egypt where he fell ill in 1947. He was moved to Basel, Switzerland, for medical care, where he died on 20 January 1948. See Richard Ettinghausen, "Ernest Herzfeld," *Ars Islamica* XV–XVI (1951): 261–66. Stefan Hauser, "Herzfeld, Ernst i. Life and Work," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, online edition, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/herzfeld-ernst-i-1>.
- 62 Abdi, "Nationalism, Politics, and the Development of Archaeology in Iran," p. 61.
- 63 Noël Siver, "Pope, Arthur Upham," *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, online edition, July 20, 2005, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/pope-arthur-upham>.
- 64 Abdi, "Nationalism, Politics, and the Development of Archaeology in Iran," pp. 61–62.
- 65 AN, F/17/17245, dossier II [J. de Morgan to MIP, 29/10/1897].
- 66 Sadeq Malek Shahmirzadi, "Barrasi-ye tahavvolat-e motale'at-e bastanshenasi dar Iran," pp. 373–447.
- 67 Pierre Amiet, "A propos du centenaire des Antiquités iraniennes au Louvre," in *Hommage à Hubert Lalande: Art, objets d'art, collections – études sur l'art du Moyen âge et de la Renaissance, sur l'histoire du goût et des collections* (Paris: Blanchard,

148 Nader Nasiri-Moghaddam

- 1987), pp. 227–31: 229. For more information about David David-Weill see *Les donateurs du Louvre* (Paris: Ministère de la culture, 1989), p. 183.
- 68 Amiet, “A propos du centenaire des Antiquités iraniennes au Louvre,” p. 229.
- 69 Mousavi, “Ernst Herzfeld, Politics, and Antiquities Legislation in Iran,” p. 471.
- 70 Ahmad Tehrani Moqaddam, “Negahi be Muzeh-ye melli-ye Iran,” *Muzeh-ha* 9–10 (1369/1990), pp. 2–13: 3.
- 71 For more information about Siroux, see Chahriyar Adle, “Maxime Siroux,” *Le monde iranien et l’islam* III (1975), pp. 127–29.
- 72 For more on the architecture of the Pahlavi period, see Talinn Grigor’s contribution to the present volume, Chapter 5; see also Kamran Safamanesh, “Architectural Historiography, 1921–42,” in Touraj Atabaki, ed., *Iran in the 20th Century* (London: Tauris, 2009), pp. 121–53.
- 73 Ma’sumi, “Shamma’i az pishineh-ye bastanshenasi-ye Iran,” pp. 155–65.
- 74 Donald N. Wilber, *Riza Shah Pahlavi: The Resurrection and Reconstruction of Iran* (Hicksville, NY: Exposition Press, 1975), p. 179, quoted in Goode, *Negotiating for the Past*, p. 174.
- 75 Mariam Habibi, *L’interface France–Iran 1907–1938: une diplomatie voilée* (Paris: L’Harmattan, 2004), p. 353.
- 76 “This sovereign who claims to be modern, does not want it said that if you scratch the Shah you find the Cossack,” see Yann Richard, *L’Iran: naissance d’une république islamique* (Paris: La Martinière, 2006), pp. 240–41.
- 77 Abdi, “Nationalism, Politics, and the Development of Archaeology in Iran,” p. 62.
- 78 Ibid., p. 59. For more information about the “Ziviyeh Affair” see Rashid Keykhosravi, *Dowran-e bi-khabari ya gharat-e asar-e farhangi-ye Iraniyan* (Tehran: published by author, 1363/1984).
- 79 Mousavi, “Ernst Herzfeld, Politics, and Antiquities Legislation in Iran,” p. 471.
- 80 *Qanun raje’ be hefz-e asar-e ‘atiqeh* [Law concerning the preservation of national antiquities] (Tehran: Vezarat-e farhang, 1309/1930), pp. 1–7.
- 81 For the application of this law, the Iranian Ministry of Education adopted on 25 Bahman 1309 (14 February 1931) the respective *nezam-nameh*, which consisted of 36 articles. These rules were modified by the ministry and turned into 52 articles altogether, which were again approved by the Council of Ministers on 28 Aban 1311 (19 November 1932): 1st art. (explanation, *ta’rif*); 2–11 arts. (immovable antiquities, *‘atiqat-e gheyr-e manqul*); 12–17 arts. (movable antiquities, *‘atiqat-e manqul*); 18–37 arts. (excavations, *hafriyat*); 38–52 arts. (trade of antiquities, *tejarat-e ‘atiqat*).